

Neel Chatterjee (SBN 173985)
nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com

James Lin (SBN 310440)
jlin@goodwinlaw.com

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
135 Commonwealth Drive
Menlo Park, California 94025
Tel.: +1 650 752 3100
Fax.: +1 650 853 1038

Brett Schuman (SBN 189247)
bschuman@goodwinlaw.com

Shane Brun (SBN 179079)
sbrun@goodwinlaw.com

Rachel M. Walsh (SBN 250568)
rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com

Hayes P. Hyde (SBN 308031)
hhyde@goodwinlaw.com

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111
Tel.: +1 415 733 6000
Fax.: +1 415 677 9041

Hong-An Vu (SBN 266268)
hvu@goodwinlaw.com

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
601 S. Figueroa Street, 41st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Tel.: +1 213 426 2500
Fax.: +1 213 623 1673

Attorneys for Defendant: Otto Trucking LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

WAYMO LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;
OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING
LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**DEFENDANT OTTO TRUCKING'S
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF WAYMO
LLC'S MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 16**

Hearing Date: September 20, 2017

Hearing Time: 8:00 a.m.

Courtroom: 8 (19th Floor)

Judge: The Honorable William Alsup

Trial: October 10, 2017

Filed/Lodged Concurrently with:

1. Chatterjee Declaration
2. Gruver Declaration

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT
SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

Plaintiff Waymo, LLC (“Waymo”) seeks to preclude defendants from putting on testimony from one of its own former employees regarding its public disclosure of Waymo’s purported trade secrets. Leaving aside the undisputed record that defendant Otto Trucking LLC (“Otto Trucking”) disclosed Ms. Seval Oz and the earrings made from printed circuit boards during fact discovery, Waymo should have disclosed this information itself. Otto Trucking respectfully requests that Waymo’s Motion *In Limine* No. 16 be denied.

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS.

Ms. Oz was an employee of Google’s Self-Driving Car Program (Project Chauffeur) from approximately March of 2011 through August of 2014. Declaration of Neel Chatterjee in Support of Opposition to Waymo’s Motion *in Limine* No. 16 (“Chatterjee Decl.”), Ex. 1. She currently works at Aurima, Inc., an artificial intelligence startup focused on autonomous vehicles, funded by Waymo’s parent company, Alphabet, through its venture fund, Gradient Ventures. *See id.*

The printed circuits boards that ultimately became Ms. Oz’s earrings were not stored in any locked or secured location, and were available in many places throughout Project Chauffeur’s offices. Declaration of Daniel Gruver, ¶ 5. Daniel Gruver, then-technical program manager on Project Chauffeur’s LiDAR team, had a number of printed circuit boards on his desk located in a common area accessible to other employees. *Id.* Mr. Gruver recalls that Ms. Oz had suggested that the boards could make good earrings. *Id.* at ¶ 7. He did not recall anyone at Project Chauffeur expressing concern about Ms. Oz receiving the printed circuit boards. *Id.* at ¶ 8.

At no point during discovery has Waymo disclosed Ms. Oz, or the more general practice at Google and Project Chauffeur of letting employees retain mementos that included its LiDAR systems. Indeed, in its responses to Defendants’ interrogatories, Waymo stated that it was not aware of any instances where its purported trade secrets were publicly or otherwise disclosed to third parties. Chatterjee Decl., Ex. 2 (Response to Interrogatory No. 6). While taking the depositions of several of its former employees, Waymo did not ask them about public disclosure of trade secrets aside from a few patents and publications.

Otto Trucking listed Ms. Oz as a person likely having discoverable information in its Initial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1), served on June 21, 2017. Ex. H to

Waymo's Motion *in Limine* No. 16 ("Waymo Ex.") at 21-22. At all times since then, Ms. Oz has been on Otto Trucking's witness list. Given the accelerated schedule in this case, on or about August 2, 2017, the Special Master requested that the parties pare down their lists of witnesses and eliminate anyone that they did not intend to rely on at trial. Ms. Oz remained on Otto Trucking's witness list, and counsel identified her as a third party who would need to be subpoenaed. Chatterjee Decl., Ex. 3 (H. Vu email to service lists, 8/10/17). At no point did Otto Trucking remove Ms. Oz from its witness lists, and at no point did Waymo attempt to subpoena Ms. Oz or further pursue her deposition. *See id.* at Ex. 4 (H. Vu email to service lists, 8/12/17).

In its interrogatory responses dated July 31, 2017, Otto Trucking expressly disclosed that [REDACTED] Waymo Ex. F, at p. 4 (Objs. and Resps. to Waymo's Second Set Common Rqs). At least two witnesses mentioned or discussed Ms. Oz during their deposition testimony. Chatterjee Decl., Ex. 5 (Dep. of Michael Xing at 14:17-33:4); Ex. 6 (Dep. of Dmitri Dolgov at 44:1-45:9). Ms. Oz's earrings were produced and made available to Waymo's counsel at the deposition of Pierre-Yves Droz on August 22, 2017. *See Id.* at Ex. 7 (Dep. of Pierre-Yves Droz at 33:22-39:8). During that deposition, pictures of the earrings were taken and were included as exhibits to the transcript. Counsel for Otto Trucking has expressly stated that the earrings were available for inspection by Waymo. *Id.* at 39:5-10. Otto Trucking has not received any request to inspect the earrings.

In response to a request for communications with Ms. Oz, third-party Anthony Levandowski produced text messages with Ms. Oz on August 23, which reflected his conversations with Ms. Oz regarding the earrings. *See* Waymo Exs. B, C, D.

II. ARGUMENT

Waymo contends – without citing to any legal authority – that suspected involvement by Mr. Levandowski in locating Ms. Oz's earrings is somehow a basis for precluding this evidence. This amounts to an absurdity – the mere suspicion that Mr. Levandowski provided information to counsel is not grounds for excluding evidence. Moreover, Waymo's contention that Mr. Levandowski has not cooperated in discovery is not correct, as he has produced documents

1 pursuant to subpoena, including in response to a request regarding Ms. Oz's earrings. In addition,
 2 Ms. Oz had discussed the earrings with others at Project Chauffeur. *See* Gruver Decl., ¶¶ 7-9.

3 To the extent that Waymo argues that any involvement by Mr. Levandowski risks a waiver
 4 of any party's privilege or his rights under the Fifth Amendment, the law is clear that a witness
 5 may "pick the point beyond which he will not go" and refuse to answer questions about matters
 6 already discussed. *See Shendal v. U.S.*, 312 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1963); *In re Master Key Litig.*,
 7 507 F.2d 292, 293-94 (9th Cir. 1974) ("The proper inquiry in this case . . . is not whether [the
 8 witness] waived his privilege simply by giving incriminating testimony as to certain company
 9 practices, but whether, in light of his prior disclosures, the testimony sought could possibly
 10 incriminate him further."). Waymo had the opportunity to ask Mr. Levandowski about public
 11 disclosures and disclosures to third-parties of Waymo's alleged trade secrets, but it chose not to do
 12 so, either through a subpoena or at a deposition. Waymo cannot now use any purported
 13 involvement by Mr. Levandowski as a basis for excluding this evidence.

14 As to Waymo's objections under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 and 37, Waymo's motion fails because
 15 the record shows that Otto Trucking disclosed Ms. Oz as a witness nearly two months before the
 16 close of discovery in its initial disclosures. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c)(1); *see, e.g., 3Com Corp. v.*
 17 *Realtek Semiconductor Corp.*, No. C 03-2177 VRW, 2008 WL783383, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 24,
 18 2008) (denying motion where at least one document was produced before close of discovery and
 19 finding no prejudice as to the use of others at trial). She remained on Otto Trucking's disclosures
 20 even after the parties were asked to pare down their witness lists. As such, Waymo cannot now
 21 argue that it had no knowledge of her as a witness, or no reason to depose her.

22 None of the four factors identified by Waymo – (1) prejudice or surprise to the party
 23 against whom evidence is offered; (2) ability to cure any prejudice; (3) likelihood of disruption of
 24 trial; and (4) bad faith or willfulness – support excluding Ms. Oz's testimony or the earrings
 25 themselves. *See Lanard Toys Ltd. v. Novelty, Inc.*, 375 Fed. App'x 705, 713 (9th Cir. 2010).
 26 First, even assuming, *arguendo*, that disclosure of Ms. Oz and the PCB earrings was untimely,
 27 Waymo cannot argue prejudice because they were equally in possession of this information as
 28 defendants were. *See, e.g., L&L Franchise, Inc. v. Tsai*, 2008 WL 11337594, at *2-3 (S.D. Cal.

Mar. 7, 2008) (denying motion to exclude where moving party knew of documents and documents were publicly available). Waymo cannot dispute that Ms. Oz was an employee at Waymo and Project Chauffeur. Waymo also cannot hide its head in the sand and pretend that it did not know of the practices at Project Chauffeur for departing employees to keep mementos, including parts of Waymo's LiDAR systems. Because such disclosures and information can constitute public disclosure of Waymo's purported trade secrets, Waymo should have disclosed this information itself during discovery. Second, Waymo had the opportunity to cure any prejudice that would have resulted, as it had the opportunity to depose or subpoena Ms. Oz and to inspect and photograph the earrings. That Waymo chose not to is no fault of Otto Trucking's. Third, Waymo halfheartedly argues that the earrings and Ms. Oz's testimony will "serve to disrupt trial" by introducing "outdated Waymo technology" that would be inadmissible under Fed. R. Evid. 403. The earrings and Ms. Oz's testimony are relevant to Waymo's public disclosure of its alleged trade secrets and the measures Waymo took to protect its alleged trade secrets. *See, e.g.,* Cal. Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)(2); *Townsend v. Akamai Techs., Inc.*, 2009 WL 10672745, at *2 (C.D. Cal. May 14, 2009) (granting summary judgment and finding "Plaintiff has presented no evidence that he took reasonable steps" to maintain secrecy). The probative value of this evidence outweighs any potential undue prejudice to Waymo. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 403. Finally, Waymo admits that the Court need not consider the fourth factor, and as demonstrated above, Otto Trucking cannot be said to have abdicated its discovery duties by including a witness in its initial disclosures.

Waymo's meritless accusations appear to rest on the timing of the production of the earrings. The production, however, occurred before the close of discovery and before a large number of depositions took place. Given the compressed schedule in this litigation, all of the parties have been supplementing their productions through the close of discovery. For example, on the last day of fact discovery, Waymo produced over 7200 documents – about one-third of its total production, long after most depositions were completed. Waymo cannot be heard to complain about Otto Trucking's production – let alone seeking sanctions under Rule 37 – in light of their own repeated and belated supplementation of discovery.

For the above-stated reasons, Waymo's Motion *in Limine* No. 16 should be denied.

1 Dated: September 13, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

2 By: /s/ Neel Chatterjee
3 Neel Chatterjee
4 *nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com*
5 Brett Schuman
6 *bschuman@goodwinlaw.com*
7 Shane Brun
8 *sbrun@goodwinlaw.com*
9 Rachel M. Walsh
10 *rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com*
11 Hong-An Vu
12 *hvu@goodwinlaw.com*
13 Hayes P. Hyde
14 *hhyde@goodwinlaw.com*
15 James Lin
16 *jlin@goodwinlaw.com*
17 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**

18 *Attorneys for Defendant: Otto Trucking LLC*

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am employed in the County of San Francisco, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is: Three Embarcadero Street, 28th Floor, San Francisco, California 94111.

On **September 13, 2017**, I electronically served the following document on the persons below as follows:

**DEFENDANT OTTO TRUCKING'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF WAYMO
LLC'S MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 16**

Charles K. Verhoeven
David A. Perlson
Melissa Baily
John Neukom
Jordan Jaffe
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-4788

Counsel for Plaintiff: *Waymo LLC*
Telephone: 415.875.6600
Facsimile: 415.875.6700
QE-Waymo@quinnemanuel.com

David Cooper
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor,
New York, New York 10010

Counsel for Plaintiff: *Waymo LLC*
Telephone: 212.849.7000
Facsimile: 212.849.7100
QE-Waymo@quinnemanuel.com

Michelle W. Fox
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
111 Elizabeth Street, Level 15
Sydney NSW 2000, Australia

Counsel for Plaintiff: *Waymo LLC*
Telephone: 011.61.2.9146.3500
michellefox@quinnemanuel.com

Leo P. Cunningham
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH &
ROSATI
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050

Counsel for Plaintiff: *Waymo LLC*
Telephone: 650.493.9300
Facsimile: 650.493.6811
lcunningham@wsgr.com

Arturo J. Gonzalez
Daniel Pierre Muino
Eric Akira Tate
Esther Kim Chang
Matthew Ian Kreeger
Michael A. Jacobs
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*
and *Ottomotto LLC*
Telephone: 415.268.7000
Facsimile: 415.268.7522
UberWaymoMoFoAttorneys@mofo.com

Michelle Ching Youn Yang
MORRISON FOERSTER LLP
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*
and *Ottomotto LLC*
Telephone: 202.887.1500
Facsimile: 202.887.0763
UberWaymoMoFoAttorneys@mofo.com

Rudolph Kim
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
755 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*
and *Ottomotto LLC*
Telephone: 650.813.5600
Facsimile: 650.494.0792
UberWaymoMoFoAttorneys@mofo.com

Wendy Joy Ray
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
707 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 6000
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*
and *Ottomotto LLC*
Telephone: 213.892.5200
Facsimile: 213.892.5454
UberWaymoMoFoAttorneys@mofo.com

Michael Darron Jay
BOIES SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
401 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 850
Santa Monica, CA 90401

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*
and *Ottomotto LLC*
Telephone: 310.752.2400
Facsimile: 310.752.2490
BSF_EXTERNAL_UberWaymoLit@bsflp.com

Meredith Richardson Dearborn
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
435 Tasso Street, Suite 205
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*
and *Ottomotto LLC*
Telephone: 650.445.6400
Facsimile: 650.329.8507
BSF_EXTERNAL_UberWaymoLit@bsflp.com

Hamish Hume
Jessica E Phillips
Karen Leah Dunn
Kyle N. Smith
Martha Lea Goodman
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
1401 New York Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20005

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*
and *Ottomotto LLC*
Telephone: 202.237.2727
Facsimile: 202.237.6131
BSF_EXTERNAL_UberWaymoLit@bsflp.com

John P. Lahad
Joseph S. Grinstein
SUSMAN GODFREY LLP
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100
Houston, TX 77002

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*
and *Ottomotto LLC*
Telephone: 713.653.7859
Uber-sg@lists.susmangodfrey.com

William Christopher Carmody
Shawn J. Rabin
Cory Buland
Halley W. Josephs
Ian M. Gore
SUSMAN GODFREY LLP
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*
and *Ottomotto LLC*
Telephone: 212.336.8330
Uber-sg@lists.susmangodfrey.com

Genevieve Vose Wallace
Matthew R. Berry
SUSMAN GODFREY LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3800
Seattle, WA 98101

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*
and *Ottomotto LLC*
Telephone: 206.516.3836
Facsimile:
Uber-sg@lists.susmangodfrey.com

John L. Cooper
FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP
235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104

Appointed by Court as: *Special Master*
Telephone: 415.954.4410
Facsimile: 415.954.4480
jcooper@fbm.com

☐ (MAIL). I placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this firm's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Los Angeles, California.

☐ (OVERNIGHT DELIVERY). I deposited in a box or other facility regularly maintained by FedEx, an express service carrier, or delivered to a courier or driver authorized by said express service carrier to receive documents, a true copy of the foregoing document in sealed envelopes or packages designated by the express service carrier, addressed as stated above, with fees for overnight delivery paid or provided for.

☒ (E-MAIL or ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION). Based on a court order or *an agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission*, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the e-mail addresses listed. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on **September 13, 2017**, at San Francisco, California.

Hayes P. Hyde
(Type or print name)

/s/ Hayes P. Hyde
(Signature)